

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-28, 31-39, and 42-44 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 5, 6, 10-17, 20-28, 31-34, 38, 39, 43, and 44 have been amended. Claims 7, 8, 18, 19, 29, 30, 40, 41, and 45 are hereby canceled without prejudice. Claims 46-60 have been withdrawn. No new matter has been added.

In the office action dated November 12, 2008, claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(a) and claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims consistent with the following remarks.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Supervisory Patent Examiner Wu and Examiner McDowell for conducting an interview with applicants' undersigned representative on February 3, 2009. Applicants' representative and the examiners discussed the subject matter of the claims and the amendments presented herein. Applicants set forth below a summary of the arguments presented in the interview.

Drawings

The office action is silent as to the acceptance of the drawings filed with this application on January 30, 2004. Applicants respectfully request that the examiner indicate in the next official communication whether the drawings are accepted.

Amendments to the Specification

Applicants respectfully request that paragraphs [0001] and [0002] of the specification be amended as recited herein to remove references to attorney docket numbers.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §102

In the office action, claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0198029 issued to Tenhunen *et*

al. (hereinafter referred to as “Tenhunen”). Claim 45 is hereby canceled without prejudice. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 45.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C §103

In the office action, claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12, 13, 15-20, 23, 24, 26-31, 34, 35, and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tenhunen in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0073462 issued to Zatloukal *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Zatloukal”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites “**detecting a change in orientation of the display** from a first orientation to a second orientation at the computing device; and **responsive to the detection of the change in orientation of the display**, automatically logically remapping the commands to the logical buttons based on the second orientation of the display.” Applicants respectfully assert that these elements are not disclosed in the cited references.

In the rejection of claim 1, the office action cites that Zatloukal at figure 3, element 310. Zatloukal describes element 310 in paragraph [0030]: “Cover **100** is designed to attach to a core unit of a mobile device (such as the core unit of wireless mobile phone **300** of FIG. 3), in a side way manner (as denoted by arrow **310** of FIG. 3).” Element 310 of Zatloukal is merely an arrow indicating the direction of attachment of the cover described in Zatloukal. As should be readily recognized, this is not the same as detecting a change in orientation of the display.

The remaining text in Zatloukal describing Zatloukal’s Figure 3 also fails to disclose or suggest detecting **a change in orientation of the display** from a first orientation to a second orientation at the computing device; and responsive to the detection of the change in orientation of the display, automatically logically remapping the commands to the logical buttons based on the second orientation of the display. The entirety of the text of Zatloukal relating to Zatloukal’s Figure 3 (paragraphs [0035]-[0037]) recites:

[0035] FIG. 3 illustrates a perspective view of cover **100** of the present invention, attached to a core unit of a mobile device. For the illustrated embodiment, mobile device **300** is a wireless mobile phone. In particular, mobile device **300** includes display **301**, where an application may render displays in at least one of two orientations, “normal” orientation **302**, and

"rotated" orientation **304**, as described earlier, and an expansion I/O interface (covered by cover **100**).

[0036] The expansion I/O interface comprises contacts that are complementary to the output "pins" of ASIC **202**. Further, the expansion I/O interface is disposed at a location on an outer surface of the core unit of mobile device **300** corresponding to the disposition location of ASIC **202** on cover body **110**.

[0037] From the descriptions to follow, it shall be readily apparent to one skilled in the art that the present invention may also be practiced with other types of interfaces, as well as with other mobile devices, in particular, personal digital assistants.

Disclosing that a display may be available to an application to render displays in one of two orientations is not the same as detecting a change in orientation of the display. Moreover, nowhere in this section of Zatloukal is, responsive to the detection of the change in orientation of the display, automatically logically remapping the commands to the logical buttons based on the second orientation of the display disclosed or suggested.

The office action further cites elements 302 and 304 in figure 3 of Zatloukal. These elements are Zatloukal's "normal" orientation (302) and "rotated" orientation (304) of Zatloukal's display. However, as should be appreciated from the text associated with Figure 3 excerpted above, there is no disclosure or suggestion in this section Zatloukal of detecting a change in orientation of the display from a first orientation to a second orientation at the computing device, and responsive to the detection of the change in orientation of the display, automatically logically remapping the commands to the logical buttons based on the second orientation of the display.

Tenhunen fails to cure these deficiencies of Zatloukal. Because Tenhunen and Zatloukal, taken individually or together, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1, and the configuration of those elements, Tenhunen and Zatloukal cannot be said to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claims 1. For similar reasons, independent claims 12, 23, and 34 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Tenhunen and Zatloukal. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 5 recites “detecting a change in orientation of the display device and, responsive to the detection of the change in orientation of the display device, automatically changing the orientation of the display.” Applicants respectfully assert that these elements are not disclosed in the cited references.

In the rejection of claim 5, the office action cites Zatloukal figure 3, elements 302 and 304. As set forth above, these elements and the related text merely describe two possible orientations of Zatloukal’s display. There is no disclosure or suggestion of detecting a change in orientation of the display device and, responsive to the detection of the change in orientation of the display device, automatically changing the orientation of the display.

Tenhunen fails to cure these deficiencies of Zatloukal. Because Tenhunen and Zatloukal, taken individually or together, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 5 and the configuration of those elements, Tenhunen and Zatloukal cannot be said to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 5. For similar reasons, claims 16, 27, and 38 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Tenhunen and Zatloukal. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 16, 27, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 6 recites “detecting a command to change the orientation of the display from the first orientation to the second orientation and, responsive to the detection of the command, automatically changing the orientation of the display from the first orientation to the second orientation.” Claims 17, 28, and 39 recite elements substantially similar. Applicants respectfully assert that these elements are not disclosed in any of the cited references.

Because Tenhunen and Zatloukal, taken individually or together, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 6, 17, 28, and 39, and the configuration of those elements, Tenhunen and Zatloukal cannot be said to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claims 6, 17, 28, and 39. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 17, 28, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants acknowledge that the office action alleges additional grounds for rejection of the remaining claims, all of which are dependent upon claims 1, 12, 23, and 34, either directly or indirectly. However, in view of the amendments and traversals set forth with respect to independent claims 1, 12, 23, and 34, applicants believe that all such dependent

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3471/304033.02
Application No.: 10/769,691
Office Action Dated: November 12, 2008

PATENT

claims are in condition for allowance, rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Moreover, applicants submit that the remaining claims recite features that provide a separate basis for patentability. Applicants reserve the right to challenge the rejection of any of those dependent claims in any future response that may be forthcoming.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-28, 31-39, and 42-44, is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 12, 2009

/Aaron F. Bourgeois/
Aaron F. Bourgeois
Registration No. 57,936

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439